

REMARKS

The Applicants thank Examiner Peter Huntsinger and Supervisory Patent Examiner King Poon for the interview on the morning of September 27, 2007. This paragraph includes the substance of the interview. It was argued by the undersigned during the interview that the present invention differs from the prior art in that the image is sent from the photographer processing unit to the fulfillment center processing unit. However, the Examiner pointed out to the undersigned that unless the word "directly" was in the claims, the claims could cover an embodiment in which the image was sent to the fulfillment center processing unit via the first processing unit (order taking processing unit). The undersigned had not previously seen that possibility; therefore, it was agreed that the claims would be allowable if they were amended to specify that the image was sent from the photographer processing unit *directly* to the fulfillment center processing unit. SPE Poon affirmed that the claims would be allowable if so amended. All of the independent claims presented in the Communication In Preparation For Interview filed September 21, 2007 have been so amended.

Claims 1 – 15 and 18 – 86 are noted as pending in this application in the Non-Final Office Action mailed June 21, 2007. However, claim 48 was canceled in the amendment filed April 19, 2007. Therefore, claims 1 – 15, 18 – 47, and 49 – 86 are the actual pending claims.

In the Non-Final Office Action mailed June 21, 2007, claims 1 – 3, 5, 7, 18 – 20, 22, 24 – 30, 39 – 46, 48 (*sic*), 50, 59 – 63, 65, 67 – 73, and 82 – 86 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiimori (US Patent No. 6,853,461, hereinafter "Shiimori") and further in view of Cocotis et al. (US Patent No. 6,980,964, hereinafter "Cocotis et al."). This rejection is overcome by the above-mentioned amendments to the claims.

Claims 4, 6, 8 – 14, 31 – 34, 47, 49, 51- 57, and 74 – 77 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiimori and Cocotis et al., as applied to claims 1, 7, 29, 30, 44, 50, 72, and 73 above, and further in view of well-known prior art. This rejection is overcome by the above-mentioned amendments to the claims.

Application No. 09/960,162
Amendment dated October 3, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2007

Docket No.: 010684.0103PTUS

Claims 15, 21, 58, and 64 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiimori and Cocotis et al., as applied to claims 1, 20, 44, and 63 above, and further in view of Arledge, Jr., et al. (US Patent No. 6,535,294, hereinafter “Arledge, Jr., et al.”). This rejection is overcome by the above-mentioned amendments to the claims.

Claims 23, 35 – 38, 66, and 78 – 81 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiimori and Cocotis et al., as applied to claims 17, 29, 60, and 72 above, and further in view of Garfinkle et al. (US Patent No. 6,017,157, hereinafter “Garfinkle et al.”). This rejection is overcome by the above-mentioned amendments to the claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. A Petition For Extension of Time for one month and the required fee is enclosed. Also, a fee for two independent claims and four additional claims is enclosed. Applicants believe no additional fee is due with this response. However, if any additional fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1848, under Order No. 010684.0103PTUS from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,
PATTON BOGGS LLP

Dated: October 4, 2007

By: /Carl A. Forest/
Carl A. Forest
Registration No.: 28,494
(303) 894-6114
(303) 894-9239 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants

Customer No. 24283